REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application after this amendment. Amendments of claims is not to be considered in any way an indication of applicant's position on the merits of the amended, cancelled, and/or withdrawn claims. Incorporated herein (without repetition except as absolutely necessary) are the specific recitation of the facts and the specific arguments found in previous papers.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6, 9-10, 12-13, and 21-23 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,819,445 to Stevenson et al. (the "Stevenson reference"). The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5, 7-8, 11, 14-20, and 24 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over the Stevenson reference, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,656 to Matsie et al. (the "'656 Matsie reference).

The Examiner used 35 USC Section 102(e) as the basis of the anticipation rejection because the Stevenson reference was filed before the filing date of the present application. Although applicant can establish reduction to practice prior to the effective date of this reference and/or conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with appropriate due diligence the date to swear back this reference under 37 CFR 1.131, applicant believes that the present claims are distinguishable from the Stevenson reference. Although applicant will be distinguishing the present invention from the Stevenson reference in this amendment, applicant reserves the right to swear back this reference under 37 CFR 1.131.

All the independent claims currently pending in this application (claims 1, 2, 7, and 21) clearly include the step of "generating a uniqueness identifier in a host computer." There is significant language in the specification that describe this step. The following passage is from page 10, lines 4-16 of the originally submitted application:

> "In the exemplary preferred embodiments set forth above,
> the print driver 26 generates or provides at least one
> uniqueness identifier 28 as well as the other information
> needed for rendering and printing. It should be noted that a
> dedicated processor or software driver mechanism could

also perform the process of generating uniqueness

identifiers. Further, depending on the application, specific

configurations of the computer 20, printer 22, and the print

job 27, many types of uniqueness identifier algorithms could

be used to calculate the uniqueness identifiers. Some

exemplary algorithms that could be used to calculate

uniqueness identifiers are those associated with checksums.

For example, checksum algorithms like SUM8, SUM16,

SUM32, CRC16, and CRC32. SUM8, SUM16, and SUM32

add up the total bytes in the print job or subportion using,

respectively, an 8 bit, 16 bit, or 32 bit number. CRC16 and

CRC32 use, respectively, a 16 bit or 32 bit polynomial to

calculate the checksum. Encryption keys can also be used

to create the uniqueness identifier."

The Stevenson reference, on the other hand, uses only the name of the file. Although

the Stevenson reference discloses that "the name may also include data such as the

version number, file size, and last saved date of the file," this is not equivalent to

generating. The Stevenson reference does mention that "some sort of checksum

process" could be used as part of an optional secondary check, but then goes on to

specify that the checksum process would be "on the data of the newly-submitted file."

This would exclude the possibility that the checksum process could be performed on the

host computer because the "newly-submitted file" is, by definition, already at the printer.

If this rejection is to be maintained, applicant specifically requests that the Examiner

provide specific support for her contention that the step of "generating a uniqueness

identifier in a host computer" is shown in the Stevenson reference. Because none of

the references teach or suggest the step of "generating a uniqueness identifier in a host

computer," applicant respectfully submits that the pending independent claims and the

claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Applicant's claims 6 and 8 are directed to performing an efficiency check. The Examiner sites column 4, lines 51-64 of the Stevenson reference as teaching an efficiency check. However, the cited section is directed to a secondary check to verify that the file to be printed is the same as the file stored in memory. There is no mention that this verification step in any way improves on the efficiency of the system. It appears that using the Stevenson process, if a previously rasterized is found in memory, it is retrieved and printed from recent memory without regards as to whether it is more efficient. If this rejection is to be maintained, applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide specific support for her contention that this step is shown in the Stevenson reference.

In his rejection of claims 4-5, 7-8, 11, 14-20, and 24, the Examiner combines the Stevenson reference with the '656 Matsie reference to show a method implemented for only parts of a print portion. The Stevenson reference presents a solution only when the entire print job is being reprinted. Stevenson identified the problems as the fairly common situation when numerous users all receive the same e-mail with the same attachment and want to print out the attachment. As the attachment always has a name (and other identifying information such as the name, version number, file size, and last saved date), the Stevenson reference uses this information as its identifier without any need for generating an identifier. The '656 Matsie reference is directed to a rule based selection criteria for controlling print job distribution. One of the rules is the "reuse" rule that is described at column 6, line 49 – column 7, line 11. The reuse rule states that the printer selected to print the job should be the printer that has the greatest portion of RIP files for that print job. The Stevenson reference could not work with partial print jobs because each print job is only identified by identifiers suitable to identify the entire job (e.g. the name, version number, file size, and last saved date). Without a process for generating a uniqueness identifier for parts of the print portion, the invention as claimed in the currently pending claims simply could not be implemented. Finally, the mere fact that the references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the

desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). There is no teaching in either reference that such a combination is desirable.

As the application is now in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to pass the application on promptly to issue.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-2115 for any additional fees which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Dana Oster
Reg. No. 37,621
Of Attorneys of Record
Tel: (503) 810-2560